

June 8, 1971

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

two years while increasing number of wards from three to nine:

	Yes	No
Ward I (City Hall)-----	452	374
Ward II (Garfield)-----	451	406
Ward III (Harding)-----	611	542
Total-----	1,519	1,322

Advisory measure calling for complete withdrawal of American forces from Southeast Asia by Dec. 31, 1971:

	Yes	No
Ward I-----	404	344
Ward II-----	392	391
Ward III-----	521	320
Total-----	1,317	1,265

Advisory measure supporting policies of President Nixon in Southeast Asia:

	Yes	No
Ward I-----	387	311
Ward II-----	402	300
Ward III-----	427	268
Total-----	1,216	979

Advisory measure calling for no withdrawal from Vietnam without release of prisoners of war:

	Yes	No
Ward I-----	328	373
Ward II-----	364	339
Ward III-----	486	450
Total-----	1,178	1,062

SITUATION IN LAOS

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, yesterday the doors of the Senate were closed at 11 minutes after 1 in order to discuss this tragic and secret war now going on in Laos. They were opened again at 20 minutes before 5.

Upon returning home last evening, I read two stories in the Washington Evening Star. The first, by James Doye, was entitled "Senate Discusses Laos in Secret."

The second, with a Vientiane dateline Arbuckle, is entitled, "The United States Seeks To Hide Scope of Its Role in Laos."

These two articles illustrate well the somewhat incredible position in which the people of this country and their elected representatives now find themselves with respect to the continuing tragic and clandestine war which the executive branch of the United States is both supervising and conducting in this little country of Southeast Asia.

Information which is given to the people and the Congress, in Washington, by this administration about these secret hostilities has been and is plenty weaker; but thanks to the able and courageous efforts of news media people such as the resourceful Tammy Arbuckle, at least part of the truth is now being made public. This is a wise development from the standpoint of what our democracy is all about—the people's right to know.

Mr. President, I would hope that these closed hearings held yesterday will be declassified and published at earliest opportunity; also that a maximum amount of the information presented will be declassified, so our citizens will know more of the truth about this war.

Some apparently believe part of the report in question tends to bear out denials of criticism that has been made in the past. Other aspects of said report, however emphasize both the logic and the wisdom of criticisms that have long been made in the past by those who have taken the trouble to go out and observe on the ground. If an attempt is made to

declassify the report on a slanted basis, we will have the obligation to consider what additional information should be released, inasmuch as the staff of the subcommittee I have the honor to chair are the ones who classified this report in the beginning.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the article entitled, "Senate Discusses Laos in Secret," published in the Washington Evening Star of Monday, June 7, 1971, and the article by Tammy Arbuckle, entitled, "U.S. Seeks To Hide Scope of Its Role in Laos," which also was published in the Washington Star of June 7, 1971.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Evening Star, Washington, D.C., June 7, 1971]

SENATE DISCUSSES LAOS IN SECRET
(By James Doyle)

The Senate holds a secret session today to discuss U.S. participation in the war in Laos, itself an open secret in Washington and Vientiane for the past several years.

Today's session is another attempt by some senior senators to focus on executive actions taken without specific congressional approval or knowledge, in a continuing debate over the war powers of both the President and the Congress.

Sen. Stuart Symington, D-Mo., requested the session, first of its kind this year.

"This session is being requested in light of the increasingly grave situation in that country, along with the implications of that situation for the United States," Symington said in remarks prepared for today.

"These implications may not be too clear to some members of the Senate, as our activities in Laos have been carried out largely in secret, without congressional sanction and outside the normal appropriations process."

At the session, lengthy debate was expected on the question of whether President Nixon has violated the spirit and perhaps the letter of an amendment to the Defense Appropriations Act passed last January. It provided that none of the defense funds could be used "to support Vietnamese or other free world forces in actions designed to provide military support and assistance to the governments of Cambodia or Laos."

The Moose-Loewenstein report is known to confirm published reports that between 4,000 and 6,000 Thai troops are operating in Laos under the financial auspices of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency.

Other estimates, which may be discussed, indicate that the CIA has been financing 32,000 Meo and other tribesmen in northern Laos. The Meo have been the main U.S.-sponsored fighting force to face the North Vietnamese in the Plain of Jars, and their numbers reportedly are decimated now.

[From the Evening Star, June 7, 1971]

U.S. SEEKS TO HIDE SCOPE OF ITS ROLE IN LAOS
(By Tammy Arbuckle)

VIENTIANE.—American officials admit the U.S. mission in Laos is deliberately hiding the extent of American military involvement here.

"Americans may think they know what we are doing here," one official said in referring to frequent press reports on U.S. activities in Laos, "but we do not want Americans to look into their television sets and be able to see Americans going into action in Laos."

The official made his remark in a complaint about an American Broadcasting Corp. team led by Ted Koppel which tried to film Americans getting into a helicopter in the south Laos combat area two weeks ago.

"What we are doing here in Laos is totally

inconsistent with our kind of society," a top U.S. diplomat here told a correspondent recently. "We are fighting a war by covert means and an open society can't tolerate that."

The diplomat explained that the U.S. was breaking the Geneva peace accords in Laos and "we don't want to advertise it."

The same official feels the embassy's policy of secrecy has been successful in not advertising U.S. infringements of the accords. "You could write a lot worse about what we are doing here," he said declining to go into further details.

Unfortunately, any diplomat in Vientiane will call this Geneva accords excuse hogwash.

The U.S. since President Nixon's remarks last year, has admitted in general terms the gamut of its operations here.

The Russians, who are co-chairmen with the British of the Geneva accords, have not raised any question about U.S. violations of them. Soviets in Vientiane admit the presence of North Vietnamese in Laos in violation of the accords and seem to think it natural Americans should try to counter this.

Now U.S. officials prefer to offer national security as the reason for their refusal to frankly discuss the U.S. role in Laos, but a close look at just what is being hidden and how it is being hidden refutes this claim.

An example of this is U.S. air activities over northern Laos and parts of Laos other than the Ho Chi Minh Trail area.

These activities—anything from 60 to 300 sorties a day—are described in Saigon communiques, telling of attacks on the Trail as "in addition U.S. Air Force aircraft flew combat support missions in Laos for royal Laotian forces."

There is no further information, such as the numbers of sorties, the nature of the targets, the results, etc.

In Vientiane, the air attaché's office in charge of preparing these stories refuses even to speak to correspondents.

A favorite tactic in Saigon is to refer a correspondent to Vientiane for information. In Vientiane, Americans suggest a correspondent should go to Saigon for information.

To claim that such information is withheld for national or military security reasons is somewhat ridiculous.

Obviously, the North Vietnamese or Pathet Lao know the strike was made. It's difficult to see how the number of sorties and their cost could help the enemy.

Information on targets and strikes is given in South Vietnam after operations. Why not on Laos?

The only answer to this seems to be that President Nixon, despite his promise in March 1970 to "continue to give the American people the fullest possible information" on the U.S. role in Laos, does not wish the public to realize just how large U.S. air support of the Laos government is daily and that air strikes are not limited to the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

Then there is the matter of the U.S. ground involvement in Laos.

There can be no doubt this includes a combat ground involvement by personnel hired by the Central Intelligence Agency.

Laotians and Meos talk constantly of American "commando leaders" based at Pakkao, a few miles southeast of the U.S. base at Long Cheng in northeast Laos.

Besides these "commando leaders," there are CIA case officers hired by the agency from the U.S. military who run Laos and other ethnic guerrilla units as well as Thai units.

This operation has put the U.S. in the position of being responsible for the defense of Laos through what is supposed to be a U.S. intelligence gathering agency.

These guerrilla units are stationed in front of royal Lao regular troops and the brunt of combat with North Vietnamese regulars.

The Lao military, whose understanding of guerrilla warfare is limited, berate the CIA

June 8, 1971

when these units retreat from positions under shellfire, or let North Vietnamese through to attack regular Lao units.

The high ethnic casualties are being replaced by Thai regular troops who are fighting in the Laotian mountains.

The U.S. Embassy does its utmost to prevent correspondents getting to areas of Laos where American-led guerrilla units operate.

Correspondents are refused permission to fly on U.S. aircraft to these areas, which is the only means of getting there unless one wants to risk a 5- or 10-day walk through territory mined and patrolled by Communist guerrillas.

While reporters are not allowed on the planes, Laotian civilians with official status are.

"National security" is invoked against correspondents wanting to go to Long Cheng even though there are at least 20,000 Asian civilians living there. And anyone from Vientiane who has a relative or friend at Long Cheng can visit.

U.S. officials also refuse to discuss American casualties in Laos (currently 700 dead and missing) or how much is spent for the defense of Laos (about \$2 billion annually).

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I believe that these two articles offer the best illustration I have seen in some time about the problem that was discussed for several hours in the Senate yesterday afternoon.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

THE MILITARY SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

AMENDMENT NO. 152—IDENTIFICATION AND TREATMENT OF DRUG DEPENDENT PERSONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, a recent estimate from the provost marshal's office in Saigon—the first official admission on the subject with any semblance of realism—indicates that between 10 and 15 percent of the American troops in Vietnam are on hard drugs. We are talking about 30,000 to 40,000 addicts in uniform.

In the past year, the Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics has been investigating the drug problem in our armed services as an extension of our continuing investigation of the drug epidemic in our civilian society. This investigation was initiated with the consent and cooperation of Senator JOHN STENNIS, chairman, and Senator MARGARET CHASE SMITH, ranking minority member, of the Armed Services Committee. The subcommittee staff has conducted extensive on-the-spot inquiries into drug usage in our military bases in Vietnam, Thailand, Korea, Europe, and elsewhere overseas, as well as at our bases in this country.

Based upon the information gathered by the subcommittee staff, and upon my own conversations with those returning from Southeast Asia and other areas as well, I would say that the estimate of 30,000 to 40,000 hard drug users is clearly on the conservative side. To make matters worse, there appears to be general agreement by those who have been most familiar with drug usage patterns that hard drug usage is still dramatically rising. In addition, a whole range of drugs besides the so-called hard drugs is also involved.

Our staff investigators in Southeast Asia found that narcotics and other

drugs are as readily available as chewing gum and cigarettes in this country—and they are cheap. Heroin is strong—95 to 97 percent pure, as compared to around 5 percent in most of the illegal, domestic U.S. heroin.

Fewer than a fourth of the 260,000 troops we have in Vietnam are in combat units. For the remaining 200,000, time is heavy on their hands. They are lonely, homesick, bored. With drugs plentiful and cheap, the average GI can ease into full-fledged addiction without realizing it.

So the problem is upon us, and the Armed Forces, like the rest of society, must face it realistically. Here we are talking about a matter that has a profound bearing on our national security as well as on the health of the personnel involved and the well-being of the civilian society to which these men will eventually return.

In the military, as at home, there are some who feel that drug addiction is a crime for which the sole answer is strict enforcement and harsh punishment. In this view, addicts, a disgrace to their uniforms, must be drummed out of the armed services with a less than honorable discharge.

Obviously, this is no solution. On the contrary, it fatally compounds the problem, for these men, trained in violence to defend their country, are being returned home afflicted with a deadly, crime-inducing disease they can not control. In America, where the cost of illegal heroin and other narcotics is high, the only way that most addicts can support their habit is by crime. In other words, as we release increasing thousands of addicted servicemen back into our society, we are inviting a horrifying addition to what is already the major source of crime in our cities.

This is not to say that enforcement is not important. It is. But we will never control the drug epidemic until we get at the source of the problem—the addiction itself. This means diversified programs of treatment, rehabilitation, and preventive education. Not every addict responds to the same treatment. There, of course, we are talking about a massive effort, with significant funding. But it is an investment that will pay back many times over.

Prevention and treatment efforts by the military have so far been token, even when compared with the efforts of our civilian society, which is saying something. It is long past time that we committed ourselves to changing that fact.

Last April, speaking here in the Senate, I made a series of recommendations about what I felt our studies had shown needed to be done if the armed services were to realistically deal with the drug problem. I sent a copy of the recommendations, along with copies of the Staff Report on Drug Abuse in the Military which the subcommittee staff had prepared, to Secretary Laird for his comments and recommendations. I have since received a response from the Department of Defense, and I ask unanimous consent that a copy of my recommendations, and excerpts from the staff report, and a copy of the Department of Defense response be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibits 1 and 2.)

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I do not wish to dwell on the point at this particular time, but suffice it to say that I felt that the Department of Defense reply was disappointing and highly unresponsive.

Our subcommittee has spent some time now carefully looking into this problem in a systematic way, avoiding sensationalism.

I feel it is important for us to keep moving in this area, on the basis of the studied information we have obtained to date. The genuine answers to the drug problem in the military will not come overnight—they will come painstakingly, over a period of time.

So I intend to offer an amendment, for myself and Senator JAVITS, to H.R. 6531, the military draft bill. The amendment would deal with the most important aspect of the drug problem in the armed services—the need for the military to accept the responsibility of offering appropriate prevention and treatment services to those persons whom it accepts into the service and who are subsequently found to be dependent upon drugs. The amendment provides, essentially, that the armed services have the obligation to attempt to locate such individuals, the obligation to encourage them to seek out treatment and rehabilitation services without fear of criminal or administrative punishment for the addiction itself, and the obligation to furnish treatment and rehabilitation services to them while they are still in the service. These services may be provided through Armed Forces based treatment programs or through any suitable treatment program, including but not limited to programs administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Veterans' Administration, under such agreements as shall be acceptable to the Secretary of Defense and consistent with this amendment. A member may not be released from active duty until a competent medical authority shall have certified that the individual is rehabilitated, has failed to respond to adequate treatment and rehabilitation services, or has refused to accept such services. A "drug dependent person" is defined as one who is dependent upon any drug controlled by the Controlled Substances Act—heroin and other hard narcotics; stimulants; depressants, tranquilizers; marihuana, LSD and other hallucinogens, and so on—or who is dependent upon alcohol, which leading medical authorities recognize as a drug.

I ask unanimous consent that a copy of the amendment as well as a more detailed explanation of it be printed in the Record at the conclusion of my remarks.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibits 3 and 4.)

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, certainly no one can read the statistics, study the materials, or hear testimony and visit with individuals in this area of drug abuse in the services without feeling the urgency, the magnitude, the pervasiveness of the infiltration of our Armed Forces by the drug epidemic.

Senate

TUESDAY, JUNE 8, 1971

The Senate met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, who hast brought us to the beginning of a new day, enable us so to live that we may bring help to others, credit to ourselves, and honor to Thy holy name. Though the day be long and wearisome, the hours tedious and fatiguing, grant that we may be cheerful when things go wrong, persevering when things are difficult, serene when things are irritating. Grant that nothing may take away our joy, ruffle our peace, or make us bitter towards any man.

Work in and through us the plan Thou hast for this Nation. Be with our fellow workmen, the President, all who are in the executive, the judicial, the diplomatic and military services. Grant that all through this day, all with whom we work, and all whom we meet may find in us the reflection of the Master of Life, in whose name we pray. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF THE ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. ELLENDER).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., June 8, 1971.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 7, 1971, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees may be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR UNFINISHED BUSINESS TO BE LAID BEFORE THE SENATE TOMORROW, THURSDAY, AND FRIDAY OF THIS WEEK

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week, at the close of the period for the transaction of routine morning business each day, the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate go into executive session to consider a nomination on the executive calendar.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination on the executive calendar will be stated.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Jayne Baker Spain, of Ohio, to be Civil Service Commissioner for the term of 6 years expiring March 1, 1977.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is considered and confirmed.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate resume the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

STATEMENT ON YESTERDAY'S CLOSED SESSION

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, the executive session of the Senate on yesterday, of course, discussed matters which cannot be discussed elsewhere until the material has been declassified. I express again the hope that the report of the two staff members to the Committee on Foreign Relations can be declassified as soon as possible, as it does, indeed, clarify certain charges and, in my opinion, disposes adequately of those charges, particularly with relation to the alleged bombing of civilian villages in northern

Laos. Therefore, I believe the public is entitled to have this information.

As to some of the so-called disclosures in the report, I must say that I heard nothing yesterday that I had not heard before. I heard no figures that I was not aware of. I believe that what we had was a rather lengthy tempest in our ancient and honorable tent.

Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. In accordance with the previous order, the Chair now recognizes the distinguished Senator from Alaska (Mr. GRAVEL) for not to exceed 15 minutes.

THE FORTHCOMING PRESIDENTIAL ELECTIONS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, this morning I should like to take up what I mentioned earlier, the question of a change in the presidential election law in South Vietnam. The rationale proposed for our presence in South Vietnam has been that we are fighting to establish a democracy there in addition to the containment of communism.

This democracy has been questioned by many political scientists in the country in a much more extensive way than I have attempted to do. But I believe we cannot remain oblivious to recent events.

Mr. President, I believe there are many people in this country who are purposely closing their eyes to what is transpiring in preparation for the forthcoming presidential election in South Vietnam in October.

There is one gentleman who is a member of the Assembly of South Vietnam. He is 35 years old. His name is Ngo Cong Duc. He is a volatile young man, and an opponent of the present government of South Vietnam. His party is primarily anti-Communist. They oppose strongly any Communist form of government. So, along with opposing communism, they also oppose the present President, Mr. Thieu, which, of course, should be their right under a constitutional government.

But let me mention some of the events that have taken place. He was jailed, I believe, on May 29 or 30 of this year. He was jailed for an interesting reason; namely, that he has opposed the government of President Thieu. Since he is such an outstanding spokesman, he was in the process of opposing the new presidential law that was passed last Thursday in the Assembly of South Vietnam. Thus, it was probably felt, if he could be taken away from the Assembly, his voice would not be added to those deliberations—much as if a Senator here,

8437

June 8, 1971

say the Senator from Missouri, were to be arrested during a crucial aspect of a debate and then after debate and the vote were over and decided, for some reason he were to be released. That would be a most unusual occurrence and, of course, it would demonstrate clearly that we lacked democracy.

Mr. President, even American Embassy sources indicate that it is a great embarrassment to the American cause in South Vietnam to have these arrests, and to have this change in the presidential law occur in preparation for a coming political campaign. In fact, over the same weekend, another splinter party headed by Trong Noc Yeng—this party now is a pacifist party—tried to assemble. They were having a meeting of about 200 people. The meeting was dispersed under, again, the government of Thieu. They were dispersed.

This is a party within South Vietnam that is working to have peace in South Vietnam. But apparently the people in power think it is very threatening to the present Government. Lieng, the head of another party, supports the force, as is claimed by Duc. Here is the feeble ground upon which Mr. Duc was arrested and charged with murder.

He is a party man. Here are the events, as he related them. He was given a tipoff as to what would happen to him by a friend, a Government appointee at his home province.

The first indication of his trouble, he said, came on May 28 when the Government-appointed chief of Duc's home Province, Vinh Binh, told him cryptically, "I like you, but as a province chief, I must observe orders from my superiors. If you are put in jail one day, I will see you."

Here are the events that led to Duc's being put in jail. I read from the article:

Two days later, Duc continued, he was invited for a drink with Pham Huu Gia, the pro-government chairman of the local provincial councilors and Duc's probable opponent for the Lower House seat from Vinh Binh in elections this August.

Duc said Gia provoked him repeatedly by asking him whether he was determined to win the coming election and finally, according to Duc, spit beer in his face. "I resisted with my right hand to his mouth," said Duc, "causing his lip to bleed."

I continue to read:

On the evening of May 31, Duc was arrested and charged with attempted murder on a complaint filed by Gia. Duc charged that the whole proceeding was managed by the office of the provincial chief, acting under orders from the prosecutor general in Saigon.

He was held in prison until the debate had finished and the votes had been secured for passage of a change in the presidential qualifications. This provided that to be a candidate one would have to have the approval of 40 members of the Assembly or 100 councillors throughout the country.

Under the present situation, most authorities recognize that there is only one person who could meet this qualification, and that is Big Minh. It is felt that he could win against Thieu.

It is very interesting to see how they wiped out opposition by the passage of this legislation.

The conclusion is very simple. The question is asked, "Why would they now let him out of jail when they have let other people languish in jail?" The reason is very simple. Apparently the votes in the Assembly were secured to vote for this presidential qualification law by trading off for votes to implement a facet of the South Vietnamese Constitution. They said in effect, "If you put this law into being, we can release your deputies from jail."

The administration traded its votes to secure votes for the passage of this law, plus the fact that this incident, which was accomplished officially by the Government of South Vietnam, serves as a reminder to any other deputy that might want to use as a forum the Vietnamese Parliament or Assembly to talk against the Government. Mr. President, I would suggest that what Mr. Duc has done is nothing more than what I would have done.

If the United States of America can countenance this type of representative government, a government that is supposed to be a representative government, it is very difficult for me to understand. It is very difficult also for me to understand that we should continue the sham that is presently taking place.

We must realize that these elections will not be democratic or representative elections, and we associate this with the simple fact that we have Americans today who are dying in South Vietnam to sustain this government in office. I find that horrendously difficult to understand. Why we cannot take collective action as a body to do something to bring this to an end, I find most disturbing.

And I find a threat to our system of representative government. As I have said before, I will state again and again and again that until they recognize that we have made a mistake and understand that we have made a mistake, we suffer a wound, a psychological wound to the American psyche that may be irreparable.

Mr. President, how much time do I have remaining?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Alaska has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRAVEL. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

PERIOD FOR THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order there will now be a period for the transaction of routine morning business to extend to not later than 9:30 with statements therein limited to 3 minutes.

VOTERS APPROVE CHARTER CHANGE

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, recently the city of Corvallis, Oreg., like many cities of this country, had on their municipal ballot a measure concerning the war in Vietnam.

I would like to read the three ballot issues they had and the results.

The first ballot was an advisory meas-

ure calling for complete withdrawal of American forces from Southeast Asia by December 31, 1971.

That measure passed by 1,317 to 1,265. I think that would auger well for the supporters of the McGovern-Hatfield amendment.

The second measure that the people voted on was as follows:

We the citizens of Corvallis, Oreg., support the President of the United States in a tactical withdrawal of the United States troops from Southeast Asia.

That measure passed by 1,436 to 979, which would seem to give an indication of reasonable support for the President's basis of withdrawal.

The third measure was an advisory measure calling for no withdrawal from Vietnam without the release of prisoners of war. It read:

We support the return of all prisoners as one condition for peace in Vietnam and urge the President neither to surrender the Vietnam people to Communist rule nor to force communists into any so-called coalition government of South Vietnam.

That measure passed by a vote of 1,178 to 1,067.

I am not sure from the three of these exactly what to conclude about the feelings of the citizens of Corvallis. However, I ask unanimous consent to have the article to which I have referred printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VOTERS APPROVE CHARTER CHANGE

Revision of the Corvallis city charter to divide the city into nine wards instead of three and make city council terms for two years instead of six was approved by voters Thursday by a margin of 197.

Unofficial tallies showed the measure, sponsored by the Citizens for Corvallis, was approved by 1,519 to 1,322.

A turnout of about 23 per cent of the 13,000 eligible voters at all three city polling places kept city election officials busy until early morning hours counting votes. The polls closed at 8 p.m.

As approved, Thursday, terms of councilmen have been reduced from six to two years, with the number of wards increased from three to nine.

The charter amendments would go into effect at the 1972 city and general election at which time all nine council positions would be up for election.

But Corvallis Mayor Cecil Barker indicated today he planned to proceed with plans for an election on his charter revision committee's recommendations.

This election would likely be held in November.

The mayor's committee is currently in the process of reviewing the charter and has yet to make its final recommendations to the city council.

Tentatively, however, the committee had opposed the nine-ward, two-year system in favor of an at-large system of elections for four-year terms.

The amendment approved Thursday was placed on the ballot following the presentation of the 1,326 signatures to call a special election.

The amendment was prepared and sponsored by Citizens for Corvallis, a private organization working for citizens involvement in city government.

The unofficial tally was:

Initiative measure amending city charter to reduce term of councilmen from six to